

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-13639 of 2015.

Decided on:-15.02.2016.

Brahmanand and others

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Rohan Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anshuman Dalal, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of F.I.R. No.254 dated 23.9.2009 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Meham, District Rohtak (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 18.4.2015 (Annexure P-2).

This Court vide order dated December 03, 2015 had directed

the parties to appear before the trial Court and the trial Court was directed to send its report qua the genuineness of the compromise.

Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the parties have appeared before learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rohtak and have got their statements recorded. On the basis of the statements so recorded by the parties, learned Magistrate has submitted her report dated 8.12.2015 to the effect that the compromise has been entered into out of free will and volition of the parties, without any fear, apprehension undue influence or coercion and the same is voluntary, valid and genuine one.

Perusal of the report reveals that the respondent No.2-complainant has made a statement before the trial Court on 7.12.2015 to the effect that he has compromised the matter with the accused and has no objection in case the FIR is quashed. He has further stated that the compromise has been effected without any coercion, pressure or threat.

The factum of compromise between the petitioners and respondent No.2-complainant has not been disputed by learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2.

In view of the above, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings before the trial Court in the instant F.I.R.

Following the principles laid down by the Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*** and approved by the Hon'ble

Supreme Court in *Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303*, this petition is allowed and F.I.R. No.254 dated 23.9.2009 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Meham, District Rohtak (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed on the basis of compromise dated 18.4.2015 (Annexure P-2).

February 15, 2016
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE